

Remarks

The Examiner renumbered original claims 1-4 and 6-12 as renumbered claims 1-11. All references to the claims made herein are to the renumbered claims.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 12-24 are pending in the application, with claims 12, 17 and 22 being the independent claims. Claims 1-11 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 12-24 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Support for new claims 12 to 21 can be found on pages 6 to 8 and Figures 4-6 and 9 of the application as originally filed. Additionally, support for new claim 22 can be found on pages 9 and 10 and Figures 10 and 11 of the application as originally filed. Finally, support for new claims 23 and 24 can be found throughout the application as originally filed.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the abstract for being missing from the application. Applicants note that an abstract was included on the face page of the published PCT application from which the present national phase application resulted. Nonetheless, to accommodate the Examiner's objection, a new abstract is submitted herewith. Entry of this new abstract, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully solicited.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner asserted that a number of terms in claim 11 lack antecedent basis. Claim 11 has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Shapiro, Embedded Image Coding Using Zerotrees of Wavelet Coefficients (hereinafter "Shapiro"). Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 9 have been cancelled, rendering the Examiner's rejections moot.

New claims 12 to 24 are sought to be added. To the extent that the Examiner would apply a rejection based on Shapiro to these new claims, Applicants provide the following remarks. Shapiro does not disclose all of the features of the invention as defined in any of the new claims. For example, Shapiro does not disclose a significance map determined as defined in these new claims. As such, new claims 12 to 24 are patentable over Shapiro.

The Examiner also rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Shapiro, US Patent No. 5,563,960 (hereinafter the "'960 patent"). Claim 11 has been cancelled, rendering the Examiner's rejection moot. As above, the '960 patent does not disclose all of the features of the invention as defined in new claims 12 to 24. For example, the '960 patent does not disclose a significance map determined as defined in these new claims. As such, new claims 12 to 24 are patentable over the '960 patent.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious in view of Shapiro in combination with Chiang et al., US Patent No. 6,553,072 (hereinafter "Chiang"). Claims 5 and 10 have been cancelled, rendering the Examiner's rejections moot. With regard the new claims 12 - 24, neither Shapiro nor Chiang disclose together or individually all of the features of the invention as defined in any of the new claims. For example, neither Shapiro nor Chiang discloses a significance map determined as defined in these new claims. As such, the invention defined in new claims 12 to 24 would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art in view of Shapiro in combination with Chiang.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael E. Ray
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,997

Date: 9/29/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

MBR/agj
260592_1.DOC